

PARTIALLY HYPERBOLIC DIFFEOMORPHISMS WITH ONE-DIMENSIONAL NEUTRAL CENTER ON 3-MANIFOLDS

JINHUA ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We prove that for any partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism with one dimensional neutral center on a 3-manifold, the center stable and center unstable foliations are complete; moreover, each leaf of center stable and center unstable foliations is a cylinder, a Möbius band or a plane.

The structure of the new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms in [BZ] is studied. The examples in [BZ] are obtained by composing the time m -map (for m large) of a non-transitive Anosov flow ϕ_t on an orientable 3-manifold with Dehn twists along some transverse tori, and the examples are partially hyperbolic with one-dimensional neutral center. We prove that the center foliation gives a topologically Anosov flow which is topologically equivalent to ϕ_t . We also prove that for the example in [BPP], the center stable and center unstable foliations are robustly complete.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Our setting. In 1970s, M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub [HPS] proposed a notion called *partial hyperbolicity*. A diffeomorphism is called partially hyperbolic if the tangent bundle splits into three invariant bundles: one of which is uniformly contracting under the dynamics, another is uniformly expanding, and the enter is intermediate.

One of the main topics on partially hyperbolic systems is the classification. This field is the intersection of topology and dynamical systems. Extending a conjecture by E. Pujals (formalized in [BW]), J. Rodriguez Hertz, F. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures proposed the following:

Conjecture 1. *Any dynamically coherent partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold is, up to finite iterations and finite lifts, leaf conjugated to one of the following three models:*

- *linear Anosov diffeomorphism on $\mathbb{T}^3$;*
- *the time one map of an Anosov flow;*
- *the skew products over linear Anosov diffeomorphisms on torus.*

We remark that it's necessary to consider finite iterations and lifts, see the examples in [BW].

For this conjecture, partial results are obtained in [BW] and [HaPo2]. In [BW], a notation called *completeness* was proposed for the structure of invariant foliations of a *dynamically coherent* partially hyperbolic system and the completeness of the invariant foliations played an important role in attacking this conjecture. We remark that for all the three models in Conjecture 1, their invariant foliations are complete.

Recently, C. Bonatti, K. Pawarni and R. Potrie [BPP] gave a counter example to this conjecture, which is a new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold admitting a non-transitive Anosov flow. The new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism is obtained by composing a Dehn twist along a transverse torus with the time n -map of a specific non-transitive Anosov flow. The construction of the example in [BPP] depends strongly on the property of a very special non-transitive Anosov flow. [BZ] generalizes the construction of [BPP] to the general case: building partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms by composing time n -map of a non-transitive Anosov flow with Dehn twists along transverse tori. One can ask: to what extent the properties of the three models in the conjecture are preserved by the new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms? To be precise:

Question. *For the new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism in [BZ], is every center stable (resp. center unstable) leaf either a cylinder or a plane? Are the center stable and center unstable foliations complete? Furthermore, what is the relation between the new partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism and the Anosov flow used for building it?*

In this paper, we give answers to the questions above.

1.2. Statement of the results. Let M be a closed 3-manifold. We denote by $\mathcal{PH}(M)$ the set of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with the splitting of the form

$$TM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u, \text{ where } \dim(E^s) = \dim(E^c) = 1.$$

Given $f \in \mathcal{PH}(M)$, one says that f has *neutral behavior along E^c or neutral center* if there exists a constant $K > 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq \|Df^n|_{E^c(x)}\| \leq K, \text{ for any } x \in M \text{ and any integer } n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

By Theorem 7.5 of [HHU1], one has that f is *dynamically coherent*, that is, there exist f -invariant foliations $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ tangent to $E^s \oplus E^c$ and $E^c \oplus E^u$ respectively. Moreover, one has that the invariant foliations $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ are *plaque expansive*. It is well known that E^s and E^u are uniquely integrated into two invariant foliations $\mathcal{F}^{ss}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{uu}$. By Remark 3.7 of [HHU2], the neutral behavior along the center implies that the center distribution E^c is also uniquely integrable.

Given a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism f , assume that $E^s \oplus E^c$ and $E^c \oplus E^u$ are integrated into f -invariant foliations $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ respectively, then one can get an f -invariant foliation $\mathcal{F}^c$ tangent to E^c . We denote $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x)) := \cup_{y \in \mathcal{F}^c(x)} \mathcal{F}^{ss}(y)$. We say that *the center stable foliation is complete* if for any $x \in M$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x)) = \mathcal{F}^{cs}(x).$$

Although we don't have the examples of dynamically coherent partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms whose invariant foliations are not complete, we cannot rule out this possibility.

Our first result is the following:

Theorem A. *Let M be a closed 3-manifold and $f \in \mathcal{PH}(M)$. Assume that f has neutral behavior along the center, then we have the followings:*

- the center stable and center unstable foliations are complete;
- every center stable (resp. center unstable) leaf is a plane, a Möbius band or a cylinder. Moreover, a center stable (resp. center unstable) leaf is a cylinder or a Möbius band if and only if the leaf contains a compact center leaf.

Remark 1.1. By [HHU1, Theorem 7.5], one has that both the center stable and center unstable foliations are plaque expansive. Hence, there exists a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f such that each $g \in \mathcal{U}$ is dynamically coherent and every center stable (center unstable) leaf is a plane, a Möbius band or a cylinder.

By Remark 1.1, the second item of Theorem A is a robust property. However, we don't know if the first property is robust or not.

Question 1. Does there exist a small neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of f such that for any $g \in \mathcal{V}$, the center stable and center unstable foliations of g are complete?

Let ϕ_t be a non-transitive smooth Anosov flow on an orientable 3-manifold M . Consider a smooth *Lyapunov function* $\mathcal{L} : M \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ of the flow ϕ_t . Let $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ be the values of $\mathcal{L}$ on the hyperbolic basic sets. Take a regular value $c \notin \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ of $\mathcal{L}$, then $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(c)$ consists in pairwise disjoint tori transverse to the Anosov flow. We denote by $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(c) = \cup_{i=1}^k T_i$.

In [BZ], the following result is proved:

Theorem 1.2. [BZ] *There exist $\tau > 0$ large enough and k -Dehn twists $\{\varphi_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ which are supported on $\{\phi_t(T_i)\}_{t \in [0, \tau]}$ respectively such that the diffeomorphism*

$$f_{bz} = \varphi_1 \circ \dots \circ \varphi_k \circ \phi_\tau$$

is partially hyperbolic with one dimensional neutral center.

We would recall the construction of f_{bz} in Section 4, which is based on a topological result on pair of transverse foliations on $\mathbb{T}^2$. Actually, the topological result on $\mathbb{T}^2$ reveals what kind of Dehn twists can lead to partial hyperbolicity. We derive the properties of the invariant foliations of f_{bz} from the construction, we show that the center foliation of $\mathcal{F}^c$ of f_{bz} gives a continuous flow whose direction gives the same transverse orientation for $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(c)$ as ϕ_t does, and we prove that the flow carried by the one-dimensional center foliation is topological Anosov and is topologically equivalent to ϕ_t . To summarize:

Theorem B. *With the notations above, there exist a continuous flow $\{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} : M \mapsto M$ and a homeomorphism $h : M \mapsto M$ such that*

- for any $x \in M$, one has $\text{Orb}(x, \theta_t) = \mathcal{F}^c(x)$;
- for any point $x \in M$, one has that $h(\text{Orb}(x, \theta_t)) = \text{Orb}(h(x), \phi_t)$;
- h sends the positive orbits under the flow θ_t to the positive orbits under flow ϕ_t , that is, $h(\text{Orb}^+(x, \theta_t)) = \text{Orb}^+(h(x), \phi_t)$.

By Theorem A, for all these new examples, their center stable (resp. center unstable) leaves are either planes, cylinders, or Möbius bands. Moreover, their center foliations are topologically Anosov. One can ask a more ambitious question:

Question 2. *Given a dynamically coherent partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{PH}(M)$. Assume that the center stable and center unstable leaves are either planes*

or cylinders and for center stable (resp. center unstable) foliation, and there exist leaves of plane-type and leaves of cylinder-type. Up to finite lifts, is the center foliation topologically Anosov?

In [BPP], the authors build a non-transitive Anosov flow ψ_t on a 3-manifold N , whose non-wandering set consists in only one attractor and one repeller. By showing that there exists a center leaf which is not invariant under f_B^n for an integer n , one has that f_B^n is not leaf conjugated to the time one map of any Anosov flow. The composed Dehn twist forbids f_B to be isotopic to identity. To conclude, one has the following:

Theorem 1.3. [BPP, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2] *For an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the diffeomorphism f_B^n is neither leaf conjugated to the time one map of any Anosov flow nor isotopic to identity.*

One can apply Theorem B to the diffeomorphism f_B , and this gives the first example that the flow carried by the center direction of a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism is topologically Anosov, but the diffeomorphism satisfies Theorem 1.3, meaning that it is highly different from the time one-map of Anosov flow in the sense of leaf conjugacy. This shows that the action of f_B on the space of center leaves just “permutes” the center leaves of the Anosov flow on each center stable (center unstable) leaf without changing the structure of the invariant foliations of the Anosov flow ψ_t .

By Theorem A, one has that the center stable and center unstable foliations of f_{bz} are complete. But we still don’t know if the center stable and center unstable foliations are robustly complete or not. Nevertheless, for the special example in [BPP], one can get the robust completeness:

Proposition 1.4. *There exists a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f_B such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, one has that the center stable and center unstable foliations of g are complete.*

About the robust completeness of the invariant foliations for f_{bz} , we posed as the following question:

Question 3. *For the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with neutral center built in [BZ], are the center stable and center unstable foliations robustly complete?*

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Christian Bonatti whose questions motivated this paper. I thank Rafael Potrie for many helpful suggestions on writing and useful comments on math, and Shaobo Gan for listening the proof of this paper. I also thank Lan Wen and Sylvain Crovisier for useful comments.

2. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we collect the notations and results that we need.

Let f be a diffeomorphism on a compact manifold M , and recall that f is partially hyperbolic, if there exist a Df invariant splitting $TM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ and a positive integer N such that for any $x \in M$, one has

$$\|Df^N|_{E^s(x)}\| < \min\{m(Df^N|_{E^c(x)}), 1\} < \max\{\|Df^N|_{E^c(x)}\|, 1\} < m(Df^N|_{E^u(x)}).$$

2.1. Dynamical coherence, Plaque expansiveness and completeness.

Definition 2.1. *Let f be a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism. We say that f is cs (resp. cu)-dynamically coherent, if there exists an f invariant foliation $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$) everywhere tangent to $E^s \oplus E^c$ (resp. $E^c \oplus E^u$). f is dynamically coherent, if f is both cs-dynamically coherent and cu-dynamically coherent.*

A partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism might not be dynamical coherent even if the center dimension is one (see for instance [HHU4]).

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an f -invariant foliation. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(x)$ the $\mathcal{F}$ -leaf through the point x . A sequence of points $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called an ϵ pseudo orbit with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, if for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, one has that the points $f(x_n)$ and x_{n+1} belong to the same $\mathcal{F}$ leaf, and $f(x_n)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(x_{n+1})$, where $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(x_{n+1})$ denotes the ϵ ball in the leaf $\mathcal{F}(x_{n+1})$ centered at x_{n+1} .

Definition 2.2. *Given an f -invariant foliation $\mathcal{F}$. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is plaque expansive, if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying the following: if $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are two ϵ -pseudo orbits with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ and if one has $d(x_n, y_n) < \epsilon$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, then x_n and y_n belong to a common $\mathcal{F}$ -leaf for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

By Theorem 7.5 and Corollary 7.6 in [HHU1], a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism with neutral center is dynamically coherent; moreover, the center, center stable and center unstable foliations are plaque expansive. By Theorem 7.1 in [HPS] one has that the plaque expansiveness in this setting is a robust property and implies the structure stability of the invariant foliation (ie. leaf conjugacy). In [PS], the authors prove that if the center foliation is plaque expansive, then the leaf conjugacy for the center foliation keeps the center stable and center unstable foliations invariant. To summarize, one has the following result:

Theorem 2.3. *Let f be a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism. If f has one dimensional neutral center, there exists a C^1 small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, one has the following properties:*

- (dynamical coherence) g is dynamically coherent;
- (plaque expansive) the center, center stable and center unstable foliations g are plaque expansive;
- (leaf conjugacy) there exists a homeomorphism $h_g : M \mapsto M$ such that for any point $x \in M$ and $i = c, cs, cu$, one has that

$$h_g(\mathcal{F}_g^i(x)) = \mathcal{F}_f^i(h_g(x)) \text{ and } h_g(g(\mathcal{F}_g^i(x))) = f(h_g(\mathcal{F}_f^i(x))).$$

Remark 2.4. *For the homeomorphism h_g , one has that h_g tends to identity as g tends to f .*

Let f be a dynamically coherent partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism. A point y is called an *accessible boundary point* with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$ for some $x \in M$, if there exists a C^1 curve $\sigma : [-1, 0] \mapsto M$ tangent to the center bundle such that

$$\sigma([-1, 0)) \subset \mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x)) \text{ and } \sigma(0) = y \notin \mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x)).$$

The set of accessible boundary points with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$ is called *accessible boundary* with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$.

With the notations above, one has the following result due to [BW]:

Proposition 2.5. *The accessible boundary with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$ is saturated by strong stable leaves.*

We will call each strong stable leaf in the accessible boundary with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$ as a *boundary leaf with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$* or a *boundary leaf* for simplicity.

2.2. Existence of compact leaf. In 1965, S. Novikov gave a criterion for the existence of compact leaves of codimension one foliations on closed 3-manifolds.

Theorem 2.6. [N] *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a codimension one foliation on a 3-manifold M . $\mathcal{F}$ has a compact leaf, if one of the followings is satisfied:*

- *there exists a null-homotopy closed transversal for $\mathcal{F}$;*
- *there exists a non-null homotopic path in a $\mathcal{F}$ -leaf which is null homotopy in M .*

With the help of Novikov's theorem, [HHU5] proves the non-existence of compact leaf for center stable (center unstable) foliation. More precisely,

Theorem 2.7. [HHU5] *Let f be a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold M with the splitting $TM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$. Assume that f is cs-dynamically coherent, then the center stable foliation $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ has no compact leaves.*

In our context, instead of Theorem 2.7, we can also use the following result¹:

Theorem 2.8. [HHU3] *Assume that f is partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold M and admits a torus tangent to $E^s \oplus E^c$, then M fibers over S^1 with torus fiber.*

In fact, the dynamical coherent partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on manifolds fibering S^1 over torus do not admit compact center stable or center unstable leaves, see [HaPo1, HaPo2].

2.3. Anosov flow. A non-singular C^1 vector field X on a closed manifold M is called *Anosov vector field*, if there exists a splitting $TM = E^s \oplus \langle X \rangle \oplus E^u$ which is invariant under the derivative DX_t of the flow X_t such that E^s is uniformly contracting and E^u is uniformly expanding under DX_t . The flow generated by an Anosov vector field is called as *Anosov flow*.

It is well known that the Anosov flow is structurally stable, that is, the flows generated by the vector fields in a C^1 small neighborhood of an Anosov vector field are topologically equivalent to each other. The topological equivalence of two flows is defined as follow:

Definition 2.9. *Let $\varphi_t : M \mapsto M$ and $\theta_t : N \mapsto N$ be two continuous flows. We say that φ_t is topologically equivalent to θ_t , if there exists a homeomorphism $h : M \mapsto N$*

¹I thank Rafael Potrie for pointing out this fact

preserving the orientation of the flows and sending the orbits of the flow φ_t to the orbits of the flow θ_t , that is,

$$h(\text{Orb}(x, \varphi_t)) = \text{Orb}(h(x), \theta_t), \text{ for any } x \in M.$$

Different from the Anosov diffeomorphisms on surfaces, the Anosov flows on 3-manifolds might be non-transitive, see for instance [FW]. Given an Anosov flow Φ_t on M , a smooth *Lyapunov function* for Φ_t is a smooth function $L : M \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

- L is not increasing along every orbit;
- L is strictly decreasing along an orbit if and only if the orbit is in the wandering domain.

Recall that an embedded torus defined by $e : \mathbb{T}^2 \mapsto M$ is *incompressible*, if the induced map $e_* : \pi_1(T) \mapsto \pi_1(M)$ is injective. With the help of Lyapunov function, for non-transitive Anosov flows, one can separate the hyperbolic basic sets by finite incompressible transverse tori, see [Br].

2.4. Dehn twist and pair of transverse foliations.

Definition 2.10. Let $\{\phi_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a smooth family of diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{T}^2$. We say that ϕ_t gives a Dehn twist directed by $0 \neq u \in \pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if we have the following:

- ϕ_t equals to identity when t is close to 0 or close to 1;
- For any point $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$, the closed curve $\{\phi_t(x)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ is in the homotopy class u .

The Dehn twist on the torus can be used for doing surgery along an embedded torus on a 3-manifold.

Definition 2.11. Let T be an embedded torus on a 3-manifold M . We say that $\Psi : M \mapsto M$ is a Dehn twist along the torus T and directed by $0 \neq u \in \pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2)$, if there exists an embedded map $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1] \mapsto M$ such that

- $\varphi(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}) = T$,
- Ψ is identity in the complement of $\varphi(\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1])$;
- under the coordinate of φ , one has that $\varphi^{-1} \circ \Psi \circ \varphi : \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]$ is of the form

$$\varphi^{-1} \circ \Psi \circ \varphi(x, t) = (\phi_t(x), t), \text{ for any } (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1],$$

where ϕ_t is a Dehn twist on the torus directed by u .

Given two C^1 -foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ on the torus, which are transverse to each other. We define a subgroup $G_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}$ of $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2)$ associated to these two foliations in the following way:

- if there exist a compact leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ and a compact leaf of $\mathcal{G}$ such that they are in the same homotopy class α , then $G_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}$ is defined as $\langle \alpha \rangle$ the group generated by α ;
- otherwise, then group $G_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}$ is defined as $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

For a pair of transverse foliations on torus, the existence of Dehn twist is guaranteed by the following topological result:

Theorem 2.12. [BZ] *Given two transverse C^1 -foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ on $\mathbb{T}^2$. For any $\alpha \in G_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}}$, there exists a smooth Dehn twist $\{\phi_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ on $\mathbb{T}^2$ directed by α such that $\phi_t(\mathcal{F})$ is transverse to $\mathcal{G}$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.*

3. THE TOPOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE CENTER STABLE AND CENTER UNSTABLE FOLIATIONS: PROOF OF THEOREM A

Let f be a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold M , exhibiting neutral behavior along one dimensional center. Since it has already been proven that f is dynamically coherent, we denote the center stable and center unstable foliations as $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ respectively. We will first show that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ are complete, then we give the description of their leaves.

Proof of Theorem A. By the uniform transversality of strong stable direction and center direction restricted to every center stable leaf, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any point $x \in M$, the δ neighborhood of the leaf $\mathcal{F}^c(x)$ in the center stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is contained in $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$.

We will prove the completeness of $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ by contradiction. Assume that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ is not complete, by Proposition 2.5, there exists a point $x \in M$ such that $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x))$ has a boundary leaf $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(y)$ for some $y \in M$. By the invariant property of the center and strong stable foliations, we have that $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(f^n(y))$ is a boundary leaf with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(f^n(x)))$, for any integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the choice of δ , one has that when it is restricted to the center stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(f^n(x))$, the strong stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(f^n(y))$ is δ away from the center leaf $\mathcal{F}^c(f^n(x))$.

By the definition of boundary leaves, there exists a C^1 -curve $\sigma : [0, 1] \mapsto M$ such that

$$\sigma(t) \subset \mathcal{F}^c(y), \sigma(0) = y \text{ and } \sigma((0, 1]) \subset \mathcal{F}^{ss}(\mathcal{F}^c(x)).$$

Up to shrinking σ , we can assume that the length $\ell(\sigma)$ of σ is strictly less than $\frac{\delta}{4K^2}$, where $K > 1$ is the number satisfying

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq \|Df^n|_{E^c(p)}\| \leq K, \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and any point } p \in M.$$

Since $\sigma(1)$ is on the strong stable manifold of a point $z \in \mathcal{F}^c(x)$, there exists an integer N large enough such that $f^N(\sigma(1))$ is in the $\frac{\delta}{2}$ neighborhood of $f^N(z)$ with respect to the distance on the center stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(f^N(x))$. Since $f^N(y)$ is still on the boundary leaf $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(f^N(y))$, we have that the length

$$\ell(f^N(\sigma)) > \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

On the other hand, we have the estimate

$$\ell(f^N(\sigma)) \leq \max_{w \in M} \|Df^N|_{E^c(w)}\| \cdot \ell(\sigma) < \frac{\delta}{4K} < \frac{\delta}{2},$$

a contradiction. This proves the first item of Theorem A.

Let $\tilde{M}$ be the universal cover of M . The metric on $\tilde{M}$ is the pull back of the metric on M by the covering map. We denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^i$ the lift of $\mathcal{F}^i$ on the universal cover $\tilde{M}$, for $i = ss, cs, c, cu, uu$.

To prove the second item, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *For any $x \in \tilde{M}$, the lifted leaves $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(x)$ are planes.*

Proof. For any $x \in \tilde{M}$, the lifted leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ is a two dimensional manifold without boundary; to prove that it is a plane, we only need to show that its fundamental group is trivial. Assume that there exists a closed curve γ in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ which is non-null homotopy in the leaf. Since γ is null homotopy in $\tilde{M}$, then the projection of γ on M is null homotopy in M and is non-null homotopy in a $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ leaf. By Theorem 2.6, the foliation $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ has a compact leaf which contradicts to Theorem 2.7.

Similarly, we can show that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(x)$ is also a plane. $\square$

Claim 3.2. *The lifted foliations $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}$ are complete, that is, they are trivially bi-foliated by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^c$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{f}$ be a lift of f , then $\tilde{f}$ is a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism with one dimensional neutral center and whose invariant manifolds are the lifts of the invariant manifolds of f . Hence, the argument for f applies for $\tilde{f}$. $\square$

For any compact center leaf γ of f , we prove the following:

Lemma 3.3. *The center stable leaf contains γ is either a cylinder or a Möbius band.*

Proof. Up to taking a double cover of the manifold, we can assume that the strong stable bundle is orientable and we give it an orientation. If every strong stable leaf through a point on γ intersects γ only once, then by completeness, the strong stable leaf is a cylinder. If not, there exists a strong stable leaf intersects γ at least twice. Consider the universal cover $\tilde{M}$ and the lift $\mathcal{P}$ of the leaf $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(\gamma)$ which is a plane, one has that there exist two center curves which are the lifts of γ on $\mathcal{P}$, by the completeness of the center stable foliation on the universal cover, one has that for every point on γ , the strong stable curve through this point positively goes back to γ after finite length, which implies that the center stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(\gamma)$ is a closed surface, a contradiction. $\square$

The following lemma ends the proof of Theorem A:

Lemma 3.4. *Any center stable leaf which contains no compact center leaves is a plane.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ be a center stable leaf which contains no compact center leaves. We will first use the argument from [BW] to prove that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is either a plane or cylinder, then we show that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ can only be a plane.

Consider a lift $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ of $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ and let Γ be the subgroup of $\pi_1(M)$ which leaves the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ invariant, then $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is the quotient of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ by the action Γ . By Claim 3.2, we have that the space of center leaves in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ is a real line, as well as the space of strong stable leaves in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$. Hence, Γ induces two actions on these two spaces and the action Γ is a sub-action of Cartesian product of these two actions.

The action of Γ on the space of center leaves corresponds to a subgroup of $\text{Homeo}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover every non-trivial element of Γ acts on the space of center leaves without fixed point and preserving the orientation, otherwise there exists a non-trivial element of Γ leaving a center leaf invariant which implies that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ has a compact center leaf. Similar argument applies to the action of Γ on the space of the strong stable leaves, proving that this action is orientation preserving and has no fixed points. Hölder theorem [Ho] asserts that any group acting freely on $\mathbb{R}$ is Abelian, hence these two actions are Abelian actions. As a consequence, the action Γ is Abelian and is orientation preserving, which implies that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is an orientable two dimensional manifold whose fundamental group is Abelian. Once again, by Theorem 2.7, we have that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is either a cylinder or a plane.

By assumption, one has that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(f^n(x))$ contains no compact leaves for any integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will prove that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is a plane, by contradiction. Assume that $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x)$ is a cylinder, then one has the following result:

Claim 3.5. *The center leaf $\mathcal{F}^c(x)$ intersects $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(x)$ at least twice.*

Proof. Let y be a lift of x . Since leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ is complete and the group Γ is non-trivial, given a non-trivial element $\varphi \in \Gamma$, then $\varphi(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^c(y))$ is a leaf different from $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^c(y)$ (otherwise $\mathcal{F}^c(x)$ is compact), as a consequence $\varphi(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^c(y))$ intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(y)$ in a point different from y and $\varphi(y)$, hence $\mathcal{F}^c(x)$ intersects $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(x)$ at least twice. $\square$

One can take a point $z \in \mathcal{F}^c(x) \cap \mathcal{F}^{ss}(x) \setminus \{x\}$ such that the interior of the center curve L with endpoints $\{x, z\}$ does not intersect $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(x)$. By the transversality and completeness of the foliation $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}$, one has that for any point $w \in \mathcal{F}^{cs}(x) \setminus \mathcal{F}^{ss}(x)$, the strong stable leaf $\mathcal{F}^{ss}(w)$ intersects L in a unique point. Since $z \in \mathcal{F}^{ss}(x)$ and f has neutral behavior along E^c , we have that a subsequence of $f^n(L)$ tends to a closed center leaf C in the C^1 -topology. By the uniform transversality between E^s and $E^c \oplus E^u$, and the compactness of M , there exist two small positive numbers ϵ and δ such that for any two points x_1, x_2 satisfying $d(x_1, x_2) < \delta$, the ϵ neighborhood $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{ss}(x_1)$ of x_1 in its strong stable leaf intersects the ϵ neighborhood $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{cu}(x_2)$ of x_2 in its center unstable leaf in a unique point which is strictly contained in $\mathcal{F}_{\epsilon/2}^{ss}(x_1) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon/2}^{cu}(x_2)$.

We take n large enough such that $f^n(L)$ is δ close to C , then $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{ss}(f^n(L))$ intersects the annulus or Möbius band $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{cu}(C)$ in a compact center curve without boundary in the interior of $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^{cu}(C)$ (see Figure 1 below), which, therefore, is a compact center leaf in $f^n(\mathcal{F}^{cs}(x))$, a contradiction. This ends the proof of Lemma 3.4. $\square$

Now, the proof of Theorem A is completed. $\square$

At the end, we prove a property for the lifted foliations of the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism, which will be used in the next section.

Lemma 3.6. *Let f be a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism on a 3-manifold M such that f has neutral behavior along the center. We denote by $\tilde{M}$ the universal cover of M and by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^i$ the lift of $\mathcal{F}^i$ for $i = ss, cs, c, cu, uu$.*




FIGURE 1.

Then for any $x, y \in \tilde{M}$, the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(y)$ in at most one center leaf.

Proof. Assume that there exist two points $x, y \in \tilde{M}$ such that the intersection of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(y)$ contains two different center leaves L_1, L_2 .

By the completeness, there exists a strong stable segment σ whose endpoints are contained in L_1, L_2 respectively. Since L_1, L_2 are contained in the same center unstable leaf, using a classical argument, one has that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}$ admits a closed transversal which implies that $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ admits a null-homotopy closed transversal. By Theorem 2.6, one gets that center unstable foliation $\mathcal{F}^{cu}$ has compact leaves, contradicting to Theorem 2.7. $\square$

4. CENTER FLOW CARRIED BY THE PARTIALLY HYPERBOLIC DIFFEOMORPHISM OF [BZ] EXAMPLE: PROOF OF THEOREM B AND PROPOSITION 1.4

In this section, we first recall [BZ, BPP] examples and the main features of the invariant foliations, then we analyze the center behavior of the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism.

4.1. The examples in [BZ] and [BPP]. In this subsection, we first recall the construction of [BZ, BPP] example. Then we present the properties of invariant foliations that we need.

4.1.1. Construction of [BZ, BPP] example. Let ϕ_t be a smooth non-transitive Anosov flow on an orientable 3-manifold M . Then ϕ_t is a co-dimensional one Anosov flow, hence one can apply the result of [HP] asserting that for a smooth co-dimensional one Anosov flow, the invariant co-dimension one foliation is C^1 . Hence the weak stable foliation W^{cs} and weak unstable foliation W^{cu} are C^1 foliations.

Take a smooth Lyapunov function $L : M \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for the flow ϕ_t . Let $c_1, \dots, c_m$ be the values of L on chain recurrent set of ϕ_t . We take a regular value $c \in$

$L(M) \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ of the function L , then the regular level $L^{-1}(c)$ consists in pairwise disjoint transverse tori $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$. On each transverse torus T_i , the weak stable and weak unstable foliations induce two transverse C^1 foliations, and we denote by $\mathcal{F}_i^s = W^{cs} \cap T_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u = W^{cu} \cap T_i$.

For each transverse torus T_i and any $\tau > 0$, one can take a C^1 coordinate $\vartheta_{\tau,i} : \{\phi_t(T_i)\}_{t \in [0, \tau]} \mapsto T_i \times [0, 1]$ defined by $\phi_t(x) \mapsto (x, t/\tau)$. Under this coordinate, one has the following property:

- the weak stable foliation in this region is the 2-dimensional foliation $\mathcal{F}_i^s \times [0, 1]$;
- the weak unstable foliation in this region is the 2-dimensional foliation $\mathcal{F}_i^u \times [0, 1]$;

Take any $v_i \in G_{\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u}$, then we denote by $h_i(x, t) = (\Phi_t(x), t)$ where Φ_t is the Dehn twist given by Theorem 2.12 associated to v_i . One considers the Dehn twist along T_i defined by $\varphi_i = \vartheta_{\tau,i}^{-1} \circ h_i \circ \vartheta_{\tau,i}$. It is proven in [BZ] that when $\tau > 0$ is chosen large enough, the diffeomorphism $f_{bz} = \varphi_1 \circ \dots \circ \varphi_k \circ \phi_\tau$ is partially hyperbolic with one dimensional neutral center.

In [BPP], the authors built a non-transitive Anosov flow ψ_t on a manifold N with two transverse tori separating the hyperbolic basic sets. Moreover, the chain recurrent set of the Anosov flow ψ_t consist in only one (transitive) attractor and one (transitive) repeller. One can check that there exists a smooth Lyapunov function such that these two transverse tori are in a regular level of this function. One can take a C^1 coordinate for each transverse torus so that under such coordinates, the induced foliations $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ on transverse torus T_i are exactly as shown in Figure 2 (for details see Lemma 4.1 in [BPP]).




FIGURE 2. The real lines and the dash lines denote the leaves of the lifts of foliations $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ on the universal cover respectively.

In this case, the existence of Dehn twist is trivial, and one only needs to take the translation along the vertical direction. The partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism f_B in [BPP] is obtained by composing a Dehn twist along one of the transverse torus with the time with the time ψ_τ (for $\tau > 0$) large.

4.1.2. *Properties of the invariant foliations for f_{bz}, f_B .* We denote by $\mathcal{F}^l$ the f_{bz} -invariant foliation tangent to E^l , for $l = ss, cs, c, cu, uu$. For each transverse torus T_i , we lift the foliations $\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u$ to the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2$, and we denote them as $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^s$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u$ respectively. By transversality, a $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^s$ -leaf intersects a $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u$ -leaf in at most one point.

Lemma 4.1. *Let α_i be automorphism on $\mathbb{R}^2$ decided by $v_i \in G_{\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, one has that the leaf $\alpha_i(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^s(x))$ intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u(x)$ in a unique point.*

Proof. For notational convenience, we denote by

$$L_i^s = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^s(x) \text{ and } L_i^u = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u(x).$$

Now, we only need to check that $\alpha_i(L_i^s)$ intersects L_i^u .

If $G_{\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u}$ is $\pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2)$, then $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ are orientable and we fix an orientation to each of them. By Theorem 5.1 in [BZ], one can find a C^1 coordinate on $\mathbb{T}^2$ and two transverse linear foliations on $\mathbb{T}^2$ such that $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ cut one of linear foliations in same orientation and cut the other in different orientation. In this case, for any automorphism β on $\mathbb{T}^2$, one has that $\beta(L_i^s)$ intersects L_i^s .

If $G_{\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u}$ is $\mathbb{Z}$, then $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ have compact leaves which are in the same homotopy class. If $\pi(L_i^s)$ or $\pi(L_i^u)$ is a compact leaf, let say L_i^s , then L_i^s is invariant under α_i which implies that $\alpha_i(L_i^u)$ intersects L_i^s , the other case follows analogously. Now, one can assume that neither L_i^s nor L_i^u is a compact leaf. By Poincaré Bendixson theorem, there exist two cylinders $C_{u,i}$ and $C_{s,i}$ such that

- $C_{u,i}$ and $C_{s,i}$ are bounded by two compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ and two compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ respectively;
- $\pi(L_i^s)$ accumulates to the boundary of $C_{s,i}$ and $\pi(L_i^u)$ accumulates to the boundary of $C_{u,i}$.

Since L_i^s intersects L_i^u , one has that either $C_{s,i}$ contains a boundary component of $C_{u,i}$ or $C_{u,i}$ contains a boundary component of $C_{s,i}$. One can assume that $C_{s,i}$ contains a boundary component of $C_{u,i}$ (the other case is similar). Then on the universal cover, the leaf L_i^u accumulates on a $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u$ -leaf which is invariant under α_i and L_i^s intersects that α_i -invariant $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u$ -leaf. Notice that the foliation $\mathcal{F}^u$ restricted in the cylinder $C_{u,i}$ is either a Reeb component or an orientable foliation. As a consequence, one has that $\alpha_i(L_i^u)$ intersects L_i^s . $\square$

Now, one can define a homeomorphism $\eta_i \in \text{Homeo}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ which maps the point x to the point $\alpha_i(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^u(x)) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i^s(x)$. One can check that η_i induces a homeomorphism on T_i and for notational convenience, we still denote it as η_i . By definition, one has that η_i keeps every leaf of $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and every leaf of $\mathcal{F}_i^u$ invariant. Moreover, if $G_{\mathcal{F}_i^s, \mathcal{F}_i^u}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$, the homeomorphism η_i coincides with identity on union of the compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}_i^s$ and the union of the compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}_i^u$.

Consider the C^1 coordinate $\vartheta_{\tau,i}$ for $W_i = \{\phi_t(T_i)\}_{t \in [0, \tau]}$, which we chose before. Under this coordinate, we lift W_i to the universal cover $\tilde{W}_i$. The lifts of the non-compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}^{cu}|_{W_i}$ intersect the lifts of the non-compact leaves of $\mathcal{F}^{cs}|_{W_i}$ in the way shown in Figure 3. Since each φ_i coincides with identity in a neighborhood of

the boundary of $\{\phi_t(T_i)\}_{t \in [0, \tau]}$, the diffeomorphism f_{bz} sends the center leaf through $x \in T_i$ to the center leaf through $\phi_\tau(x)$. By Lemma 4.1, the center leaf through the point $\phi_\tau(x)$ is the one through the point $\eta_i^{-1}(x)$.




FIGURE 3. The dash line denotes the center leaf obtained by the intersection of center stable and center unstable leaves.

Directly, one has the following result:

Lemma 4.2. *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the action of the diffeomorphism f_{bz} on the space of center leaves intersecting T_i is equivalent to the homeomorphism η_i^{-1} .*

Consider $M^+ = L^{-1}([c, +\infty))$ and $M^- = L^{-1}((-\infty, c])$. Then M^+ and M^- are the repelling and attracting regions of the flow ϕ_t . We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ the maximal invariant sets in M^+ and M^- respectively. Hence, $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}$) is a repelling (resp. attracting) set and is foliated by the weak stable (resp. weak unstable) leaves. By construction of f_{bz} , one has that $f_{bz}|_{M^-} = \phi_\tau|_{M^-}$ and $f_{bz}^{-1}|_{M^+} = \phi_{-\tau}|_{M^+}$, which implies that

$$W^l|_{M^- \cup \mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{F}^l|_{M^- \cup \mathcal{R}}, \text{ for } l = ss, cs$$

and

$$W^l|_{M^+ \cup \mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{F}^l|_{M^+ \cup \mathcal{A}}, \text{ for } l = uu, cu.$$

By construction, the chain recurrent set of f_{bz} is contained in the union of the attracting set $\mathcal{A}$ and the repelling set $\mathcal{R}$. Moreover, the diffeomorphism f_{bz} has neutral behavior along center bundle, hence it is dynamically coherent. Since the Dehn twists are supported in a fundamental domain of ϕ_τ and keeps every center stable (resp. center unstable) leaf invariant.

For the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism f_B in [BPP], only one Dehn twist is composed and the induced foliations on the transverse torus are composed of two Reeb components. Hence, as a Corollary of Lemma 4.2, one has the following:

Corollary 4.3. *For the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism f_B , for any $j = 1, 2$ and any leaf $\mathcal{F}_j^s(y)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_j^u(y)$) of the foliation $\mathcal{F}_j^s$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_j^u$), there exists a point $x \in \mathcal{F}_j^s(y)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_j^u(y)$) such that f_B preserves the center leaf through x , that is, $f_B(\mathcal{F}^c(x)) = \mathcal{F}^c(x)$.*

4.2. Analyzing the center foliation of [BZ] and [BPP] examples. In this section, we first prove that the center foliation $\mathcal{F}^c$ of f_{bz} gives a continuous flow, then we build a homeomorphism sending the center flow of the diffeomorphism to the Anosov flow.

For the diffeomorphism f_{bz} , since the Dehn twist φ_i equals to identity in a neighborhood of T_i , one has that in a small neighborhood V_i of T_i , the center foliation $\mathcal{F}^c$ coincides with W^c . For each leaf passing through V_i , we give it the same orientation as the one of W^c given by the flow direction. Since in the region M^- , the center stable and strong stable foliations of f_{bz} coincide with the ones of the Anosov flow, by the fact that $\mathcal{F}^c$ is everywhere transverse to the strong stable direction in each center stable leaf, one has that in the region $M^- \setminus \mathcal{A}$, restricted to each center stable leaf, each leaf of $\mathcal{F}^c$ cuts the strong stable leaf with the same (locally) orientation as W^c does. As a consequence, one has that the orientation of the leaves of $\mathcal{F}^c$ passing through T_i induces the same orientation of the center leaves in $\mathcal{A}$ as the one given by the flow. One can apply the same argument to the region M^+ . As a consequence, one gets that the center foliation $\mathcal{F}^c$ is orientable, and one can give it an orientation such that

- it gives the same orientation on the set $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R}$ as the one given by the flow ϕ_t ;
- it gives the same normal orientation to the transverse tori as the one given by the flow ϕ_t .

Hence, the center foliation $\mathcal{F}^c$ can give a continuous flow, denoted as θ_t , whose orbits are the leaves of $\mathcal{F}^c$. This proves the first item of Theorem B.

Let θ_t be the flow generated by the center direction such that its direction coincides with ϕ_t on the set $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R}$ and gives the same normal orientation for the two transverse tori as the one given by ϕ_t .

We shall build the conjugation between the center flow θ_t and the original Anosov flow ϕ_t . We shall first define the conjugation on the set $M^- \setminus \mathcal{A}$ which is Id restricted to the boundary of M^- , then we extend the homeomorphism to $\mathcal{A}$ as Id. Similarly, we define the conjugation on the set M^+ . In the end, we get the conjugation between two flows.

Let $\pi : \tilde{M} \mapsto M$ be the universal cover of M . We denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^l$ and $\tilde{W}^l$ the lifts of the foliations $\mathcal{F}^l$ and W^l respectively, for any $l = ss, cs, c, cu, uu$. Given a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on M and a submanifold $M' \subset M$, the leaf of $\mathcal{F}|_{M'}$ through a point $x \in M'$ means the connected component of $\mathcal{F}(x) \cap M'$ containing x . We denote by ∂M^- the boundary of M^- , then $\partial M^- = T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_k$.

Proposition 4.4. *There exists a homeomorphism $h^s : M^- \mapsto M^-$ such that*

- the map h^s preserves every leaf of the foliation $W^{cs}|_{M^-} = \mathcal{F}^{cs}|_{M^-}$;
- the map h^s takes the orbits of the flow $\phi_t|_{M^-}$ to the ones of $\psi_t|_{M^-}$;
- the map h^s coincides with Id on the set $\mathcal{A} \cup \partial M^-$.

We denote $\tilde{M}^j = \pi^{-1}(M^j)$, for $j = +, -$. To prove Proposition 4.4, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *For any points $x \in \tilde{M}^+$ and $y \in \tilde{M}^-$, the center unstable leaf $\tilde{W}^{cu}(x)$ intersects the center stable leaf $\tilde{W}^{cs}(y)$ non-empty if and only if the center unstable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(x)$ intersects the center stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$ non-empty. More precisely, we have the following:*

$$z \in \tilde{W}^{cu}(x) \cap \tilde{W}^{cs}(y) \cap \pi^{-1}(T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_k) \Leftrightarrow z \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(x) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y) \cap \pi^{-1}(T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_k).$$

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Given $x \in \tilde{M}^-$ and $y \in \tilde{M}^+$, by Lemma 3.6, the intersection of $\tilde{W}^{cs}(x)$ and $\tilde{W}^{cu}(y)$ consists in at most one leaf of W^c , as well as for the foliations corresponding to f_{bz} . If the intersection of $\tilde{W}^{cs}(x)$ and $\tilde{W}^{cu}(y)$ is not empty, by the choice of x, y , there exists a unique point $z \in \pi^{-1}(\partial M^-)$ contained in $\tilde{W}^{cu}(x)$ and $\tilde{W}^{cs}(y)$, which is equivalent to that $z \in \pi^{-1}(\partial M^-)$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(x)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(y)$, since these foliations coincide on the corresponding region. $\square$

Now, we are ready to give the proof of Proposition 4.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. For any $x \in \tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, there exists a point $y \in \tilde{M}^+ \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ such that x is on the positive orbit of y for the lifted flow $\tilde{\phi}_t$. Let z be the unique intersection between $\text{Orb}(x, \tilde{\phi}_t) = \tilde{W}^c(x)$ and the transverse section $\pi^{-1}(\partial M^-)$, then one has that

$$z \in \tilde{W}^{cu}(y) \cap \tilde{W}^{cs}(x) \cap \pi^{-1}(\partial M^-).$$

By Lemma 4.5, one has that

$$z \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(y) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x) \cap \pi^{-1}(\partial M^-).$$

Since each leaf of the foliation $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}$ is a plane, by completeness and transversality, the center leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^c(z)$ intersects the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x)$ in a unique point and we denote it as $h^s(x)$ (as it is shown in Figure 4). Similarly, we can define a map τ^s by exchanging the roles of $(\tilde{\phi}_t, \tilde{W}^{ss})$ and $(\tilde{\theta}_t, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss})$ in the definition $h^s(x)$.

By definition, one can check that the maps $h^s, \tau^s : \tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \mapsto \tilde{M} \setminus (\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{R}})$ are continuous and commutative with the automorphisms of $\tilde{M}$ induced by $\pi_1(M)$. Moreover, one has that

- the maps h^s, τ^s coincide with Id in a neighborhood of $\widetilde{\partial M^-}$ restricted in $\tilde{M}^-$, where $\widetilde{\partial M^-}$ is the lift of ∂M^- ;
- the maps h^s, τ^s preserve the orientation of the foliations $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}|_{\tilde{M}^-}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}|_{\tilde{M}^-}$ and send the positive orbits of one center flow to the positive orbits of the other.

Claim 4.6. *The maps h^s and τ^s are injective.*

Proof. Assume that h^s is not injective, then there exist two different points $x, y \in \tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $h^s(x) = h^s(y)$. By definition, one has that $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(y)$. Moreover, x and y are on the same orbit of the Anosov flow $\tilde{\phi}_t$. Hence, x and y are joint by a segment $L(x, y)$ which is contained in the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ and transverse to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}$. Since the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ is a plane and the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x)$ intersects $L(x, y)$ twice, we get the contradiction.

The same argument applies for τ^s . $\square$

Claim 4.7. *The images of h^s and τ^s are contained in $\tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.*




FIGURE 4.

Proof. Let us first recall that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}|_{\tilde{M}^-} = \tilde{W}^{cs}|_{\tilde{M}^-} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}|_{\tilde{M}^+} = \tilde{W}^{cu}|_{\tilde{M}^+}.$$

By definition, for any point $x \in \tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, h^s maps the connected component of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x) \cap (\tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ containing x to a connected component of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x) \cap (\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Notice that each connected component of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x) \cap (\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ has non-empty interior in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x)$ and its boundary consists in lines in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\partial \tilde{M}^-$. Since h^s coincides with identity in a neighborhood of $\partial \tilde{M}^-$ restricted in $\tilde{M}^-$, by the continuous and injective property of h^s , one has that h^s maps the connected component of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cs}(x) \cap (\tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ containing x into itself, for any $x \in \tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

The same arguments can be applied to τ^s , ending the proof of Claim 4.7. $\square$

Claim 4.8. *For any points $x, y \in \tilde{M}^-$, one has that*

$$y \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x) \iff y \in \tilde{W}^{ss}(x).$$

Proof. Since $f_{bz}|_{\tilde{M}^-} = \phi_\tau|_{\tilde{M}^-}$, one can take a lift $\tilde{f}_{bz}$ of f_{bz} such that the forward orbit of x under $\tilde{f}_{bz}$ coincides with the one under $\tilde{\phi}_\tau$. If $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x) \cap \tilde{M}^-$, then the forward orbit of y under $\tilde{f}_{bz}$ coincides with the one under $\tilde{\phi}_\tau$ since $f_{bz}|_{\tilde{M}^-} = \phi_\tau|_{\tilde{M}^-}$. Hence, the distance $d(\tilde{f}_{bz}^n(x), \tilde{f}_{bz}^n(y)) = d(\tilde{\phi}_{n\tau}(x), \tilde{\phi}_{n\tau}(y))$ tends to zero exponentially. Since $\tilde{\phi}_\tau$ has neutral behavior along the center, one has that $y \in \tilde{W}^{ss}(x)$. One can argue for the other side analogously, concluding. $\square$

By definition of h^s and τ^s , one has that $h^s(x) \in \tilde{W}^{ss}(x)$ and $\tau^s(x) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x)$. By Claims 4.7, 4.8 and the definitions of h^s, τ^s , one has that $\tau^s \circ h^s = h^s \circ \tau^s = Id$. Hence, h^s is an orientation preserving homeomorphism on the set $\tilde{M}^- \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Moreover,

h^s maps each leaf of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}|_{\tilde{M}^-\setminus\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ into itself surjectively as a homeomorphism, hence one can extend h^s to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ as Id . Now h^s is continuous along each leaf of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}|_{\tilde{M}^-}$.

Lemma 4.9. *The map $h^s, \tau^s : \tilde{M}^- \mapsto \tilde{M}^-$ are continuous.*

Proof. One only needs to prove that the map h^s is continuous at $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. The case for τ^s follows analogously.

Assume, on the contrary, there exists a point $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ where h^s is not continuous. Then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence of points $\{x_n\}_{n>0} \subset \tilde{M}^-\setminus\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ such that

$$\lim x_n = x_0 \text{ and } d(h^s(x_n), h^s(x_0)) > \epsilon_0.$$

To continue the proof, we need the following result:

Claim 4.10. *On the universal cover $\tilde{M}$, for the lifts of f_{bz} and ϕ_τ , each center unstable leaf intersects a strong stable leaf in at most one point.*

Proof. If there exists a strong stable leaf intersects a center unstable leaf in two points, since the center unstable foliation is transverse orientable and the strong stable foliation is orientable, by a classical argument, one gets a closed transversal for the center unstable foliation, which implies that the center unstable foliation for the diffeomorphism on M admits a null-homotopy closed transversal. By Novikov's theorem, the center unstable foliation for the diffeomorphism on M has compact leaves, contradicting to Theorem 2.7. $\square$

Since x_n tends to x_0 , by Claim 4.10, the center unstable leaf $\tilde{W}^{cu}(x_n)$ intersects the strong stable leaf $\tilde{W}_{\epsilon_0}^{ss}(x_0) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\epsilon_0}^{ss}(x_0)$ in a unique point y_n , for n large. Then y_n tends to x_0 . Moreover, since each connected component of $\tilde{W}^{cu}(x_n) \cap \tilde{M}^-$ is the forward $\tilde{\phi}_t$ -orbit of a connected component of $\tilde{W}^{cu}(x_n) \cap \widetilde{\partial M^-}$, the backward orbits of x_n and y_n under the flow $\tilde{\phi}_t$ intersect the same connected component P_n of $\widetilde{\partial M^-} \cap \tilde{W}^{cu}(x_n)$ into p_n and q_n respectively, where P_n is a line, and the distance $d|_{P_n}(p_n, q_n)$ restricted to the line P_n tends to zero. Since $\tilde{W}^{cu}$ coincides with $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}$ in a neighborhood of $\widetilde{\partial M^-}$, one has that the forward orbits of p_n and q_n under the flow $\tilde{\theta}_t$ are on the same center unstable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(q_n)$. By the choices of p_n, q_n and Claim 4.10, one has that the center unstable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(q_n)$ intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x_0)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x_n)$ into a unique point $h^s(y_n)$ and $h^s(x_n)$ respectively. By definition, h^s is continuous restricted to the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x_0)$, hence $d(h^s(y_n), x_0)$ tends to zero. By the continuity of center unstable foliation, the center unstable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\epsilon_0/3}^{cu}(h^s(y_n)) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}(q_n)$ intersects the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{ss}(x_n)$ into a point z_n for n large, hence

$$d(z_n, x_0) < d(z_n, h^s(y_n)) + d(h^s(y_n), x_0) < \epsilon_0, \text{ for } n \text{ large.}$$

Once again, by Claim 4.10, one has that $z_n = h^s(x_n)$, contradicting to $d(h^s(x_n), x_0) < \epsilon_0$. $\square$

Now, the map $h^s : \tilde{M}^- \mapsto \tilde{M}^-$ is a homeomorphism. By definition of h^s , one has that h^s maps the orbit segment of $\tilde{\phi}_t|_{\tilde{M}^-}$ to $\tilde{\theta}_t|_{\tilde{M}^-}$, and preserves the orientation of the orbits. Since h^s commutes with the automorphism on $\tilde{M}$ induced by $\pi_1(M)$,

the projection of h^s on the base manifold defines a homeomorphism of M^- satisfying the announced properties, ending the proof Proposition 4.4. $\square$

Ending the proof of Theorem B. By applying Proposition 4.4 to the reversed dynamics on the set M^+ , one gets a homeomorphism $h^u : M^+ \mapsto M^+$ satisfying the analogous properties. We define a homeomorphism $h : M \mapsto M$ in the following way:

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} h^s(x) & \text{if } x \in M^- \\ h^u(x) & \text{if } x \in M^+ \end{cases}$$

The homeomorphism h coincides with Id on the set $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R} \cup T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_k$. One can check that h sends the orbits of ϕ_t to the orbits of θ_t and preserves the orientation of the flows. This also proves that θ_t is topologically equivalent to Anosov flow ϕ_t . $\square$

For the general example in [BZ], we don't know if the center stable and center unstable foliations are robustly complete or not, but for the special example in [BPP], we get the robust completeness. We denote by ψ_t the Anosov flow for building f_B . Now, we will use Theorem B to give the proof of Proposition 1.4.

Proof of Proposition 1.4. Since f_B has neutral behavior along the center, by Theorem 2.3, there exists a small neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of f_B such that for any $g \in \mathcal{V}$, one has that

- g is dynamically coherent;
- there exists a homeomorphism $h_g : N \mapsto N$ such that for any $x \in N$ and $i = c, cs, cu$, one has

$$h_g(\mathcal{F}^i(x)) = \mathcal{F}_g^i(h_g(x)) \text{ and } h_g(f(\mathcal{F}^i(x))) = g(\mathcal{F}_g^i(h_g(x)));$$

- the homeomorphism h_g tends to identity in the C^0 -topology when g tends to f .

We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ the attractor and repeller of ψ_t respectively. Then the maximal invariant set of f_B in N^+ and N^- are $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ respectively. By Theorem 7A.1 in [HPS], one can choose a small enough neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{V}$ of f_B such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, one has that the maximal invariant set of g in the region N^- (resp. N^+) is $h_g(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. $h_g(\mathcal{R})$). Hence, the chain recurrent set of g is contained in $h_g(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R})$.

We will first show the following:

Lemma 4.11. *For any point $x \in h_g(\mathcal{R})$, one has that*

$$\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)) = \mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x).$$

Proof. Notice that $\mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x) = h_g(\mathcal{F}^{cs}(h_g^{-1}(x)))$. We lift the foliations to the universal cover $\tilde{N}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(y)$ be a lift of $\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)$. Notice that g fixes every center leaf in $h_g(\mathcal{R})$.

Claim 4.12. *There exists a lift $\tilde{g}$ of g such that $\tilde{g}$ keeps every center leaf in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$ invariant.*

Proof. By leaf conjugacy, there is at most one compact center leaf contained in $\mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x)$. We take a non-compact center leaf $L \subset \mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x)$, and we denote by $\tilde{L} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$ a lift of L . Then there exists a unique lift $\tilde{g}$ of g such that $\tilde{L}$ is $\tilde{g}$ -invariant.

For any center leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(z) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$, by the fact that $\mathcal{F}^c$ is topologically Anosov, there exists a strong stable curve $\tilde{\sigma}(t)_{t \in [0,1]} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$ such that $\tilde{\sigma}(0) \in \tilde{L}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(1) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(z)$. Let $\sigma(t)$ be the projection of $\tilde{\sigma}(t)$ on $\mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x)$, by the invariance of the center leaves, one has that there exists a continuous family of center curves $\gamma_t(s)$ joining the curve $\sigma(t)$ with $g(\sigma(t))$. Now, we lift the family of center curves to the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$, then one gets a continuous family of center curves $\tilde{\gamma}_t(s)$ joining $\tilde{\sigma}(t)$ to a lift $\alpha(t)$ of $g(\sigma(t))$. By the uniqueness of $\tilde{g}$ and the non-compactness of L , the lift of $g(\sigma(0))$ can only be $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\sigma}(0))$ which implies that the $\alpha(t)$ can only be $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\sigma}(t))$. Hence, one has that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(z)$ is invariant under $\tilde{g}$. $\square$

We only need to prove that, restricted to the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$, every strong stable leaf intersects every center leaf. Assume, on the contrary, that there exists a strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ which is a boundary leaf of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(q))$. Since $\mathcal{F}^c$ is topologically Anosov, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c$ has the same feature. The strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ separates the leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$, which is a plane, into two connected components. The center leaves converge in one connected component and separate in the other connected component. Notice that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(q))$ is a $\tilde{g}$ -invariant set, and the map $\tilde{g}$ fixes every center leaf in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(y)$. Since $\tilde{g}$ sends a boundary leaf to a boundary leaf, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(q))$ is a path connected set, and $\tilde{g}$ preserves the orientation of each invariant bundle, hence the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ is $\tilde{g}$ -invariant. Since every center leaf in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(q))$ is fixed by $\tilde{g}$ and intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ in at most one point, one has that every point in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ is fixed by $\tilde{g}$, contradicting to the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(p)$ is a strong stable leaf, ending the proof of Lemma 4.11. $\square$

Now, we consider the center stable leaves in the region $N \setminus h_g(\mathcal{R})$. Assume, on the contrary, that there exists a point x such that $\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x)$, then let p be a point such that $\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(p)$ is a boundary leaf of $\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(\mathcal{F}_g^c(x))$. Since $h_g(\mathcal{A})$ is the maximal invariant set in N^- and is saturated by center unstable leaves, there exists an integer n large enough such that $\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(g^n(p))$ intersects $h_g(\mathcal{A})$ in a point q' . Since g keeps every center leaf in $h_g(\mathcal{A})$ invariant, the center leaf through q' is contained in $\mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(x)$ and intersects $\mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(p)$. We denote by $q = g^{-n}(q')$, then $q \in \mathcal{F}_g^{ss}(p) \cap \mathcal{F}_g^c(q')$.

Now, we lift those leaves to the universal cover. Let $\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$ be the lifts of x , p and q respectively such that they are on the same center stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(\tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ intersects $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{p})$.

Lemma 4.13. *There exist a lift $\tilde{g}$ of g and a center leaf $L \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(\tilde{x})$ such that*

- *the leaf L is disjoint from $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{p})$;*
- *the center leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ and L are $\tilde{g}$ -invariant.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)$ is fixed by g , then at most one of invariant center leaves $\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)$ and $\mathcal{F}_g^c(q)$ is a compact leaf. Assume that $\mathcal{F}_g^c(q)$ is not compact (the other case follows

analogously). Then there exists a unique lift $\tilde{g}$ of g such that the center leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ is $\tilde{g}$ -invariant. By Theorem B and leaf conjugacy, one has the following:

- the strip bounded by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$ is trivially foliated by center leaves;
- there exists a segment with infinity length $\ell \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ such that for any point $z \in \ell$, the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(z)$ through z intersects the center leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$.

Since f_B preserves the orientation of the center foliation, by leaf conjugacy, there exists a point $w \in \ell$ such that $\tilde{g}(w) \in \ell$. We take the strong stable segment $\tilde{\sigma}(t)$ through w whose endpoints are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q}) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$. Now, one can check that the arguments in Claim 4.12 apply here and one gets that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$ is $\tilde{g}$ -invariant. We only need to take $L = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$.

If center leaf $\mathcal{F}_g^c(x)$ is not fixed by g , then the center leaf $h_g^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_g^c(x))$ for f intersects the transverse torus T_1 and it is not fixed by f . Consider the connected component $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(h_g^{-1}(x)) \setminus \mathcal{A}$ which contains the center leaf $\mathcal{F}^c(h_g^{-1}(x))$, then $\mathcal{P}$ is a topological plane. Recall that on each transverse torus, the foliation $\mathcal{F}^{cs}$ induces a foliation consisting in exactly two Reeb components. Since $\mathcal{P}$ intersects T_1 into a line which accumulates to two circles contained in the stable manifolds of two different periodic orbits of the Anosov flow ψ_t , one has that the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$ restricted to $\mathcal{F}^{cs}(h_g^{-1}(x))$ consists in two center leaves belonging to the unstable manifolds of two different periodic orbits of ψ_t in $\mathcal{A}$.

Hence, by leaf conjugacy, there exist two leaves L_1, L_2 of the foliation $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c$ such that

- $L_1 \cup L_2 \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(\tilde{x})$;
- the leaves L_1 and L_2 bound a strip containing $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$;
- the projections of the two center leaves L_1, L_2 on the base manifold is invariant under g .

By the choice of L_1, L_2 , neither $\pi(L_1)$ nor $\pi(L_2)$ is a compact leaf, hence one can apply the argument in the first case and one gets a lift $\tilde{g}$ of g such that the center leaves $L_1, L_2, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ are $\tilde{g}$ -invariant. Then there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$ is contained in the strip S bounded by L_i and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{p})$ does not intersect $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{x})$, the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{p})$ does not intersect L_i . We take $L = L_i$, ending the proof of Lemma 4.13. $\square$

Claim 4.14. *There exists a $\tilde{g}$ -fixed point on $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ whose strong stable leaf does not intersect L .*

Proof. If $\tilde{q}$ is a $\tilde{g}$ -fixed point, we are done. Now, we assume that $\tilde{q}$ is not a fixed point. Denote by I_q the connected component of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q}) \setminus \{\tilde{q}\}$ such that under leaf conjugacy, it corresponds to the forward orbit of $\tilde{h}_g^{-1}(q)$ under the Anosov flow ψ_t . Up to replacing $\tilde{g}$ by $\tilde{g}^{-1}$, we can assume that $\tilde{g}(\tilde{q})$ is contained in the interior of I_q . Since the leaf L is fixed by $\tilde{g}$, the strong stable leaf through the orbit of $\tilde{q}$ is disjoint from L . We identify I_q with $(0, +\infty)$, where q corresponds to 0. For the points on I_q tending to infinity, their strong stable leaves would intersect L . Hence, one has

that the forward orbit of $\tilde{q}$ tends to a fixed point whose strong stable leaf is disjoint from L . $\square$

Remark 4.15. *Until now, we did not truly use the properties of [BPP] example. One can check that all the arguments before go through for [BZ] example.*

By Claim 4.14, for notational convenience, we assume that $\tilde{q}$ is the fixed point of $\tilde{g}$. Since the projection of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^c(\tilde{q})$ on the base manifold is contained in $h_g(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is an attractor of the Anosov flow ϕ_t , hence $\mathcal{F}_g^c(q)$ is accumulated by invariant center leaves on the center stable leaf $\mathcal{F}_g^{cs}(q)$. Hence, there exist center leaves on $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{cs}(\tilde{q})$ contained in $\widetilde{h_g(\mathcal{A})}$ which intersect the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{q})$. One can check that those center leaves are invariant under $\tilde{g}$. Since those center leaves and the strong stable leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{q})$ are invariant under $\tilde{g}$, one has that those center leaves intersect $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{q})$ into fixed points which contradicts to the uniform contraction of $\tilde{g}$ along $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_g^{ss}(\tilde{q})$. Hence, the center stable foliation of g is complete.

Similar argument applies for the center unstable foliation of g . $\square$

We point out that we use [BPP] example to get robust completeness instead of [BZ] example, because we need the orbits (for Anosov flow) in the attracting set (resp. repelling set) are not isolated on it stable (resp. unstable) manifolds.

REFERENCES

- [BPP] C. Bonatti, K. Parwani and R. Potrie, *Anomalous partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms I: dynamically coherent examples*. to appear at Annales Sci. ENS.
- [BGHP] C. Bonatti, A. Gogolev, A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie, *Anomalous partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms III: abundance and incoherence*, in preparation.
- [BW] C. Bonatti and A. Wilkinson, *Transitive partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on 3-manifolds*. Topology 44 (2005), no. 3, 475–508.
- [BZ] C. Bonatti and J. Zhang, *Transverse foliations on the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$ and partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on 3-manifolds*, To appear at Comment. Math. Helv. arXiv:1602.04355.
- [BBI] M. Brin, D. Burago and S. Ivanov, *On partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms of 3-manifolds with commutative fundamental group*. Modern dynamical systems and applications, 307–312, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [Br] M. Brunella, *Separating the basic sets of a nontransitive Anosov flow*. Bull. London Math. Soc. 25 (1993), no. 5, 487–490.
- [CN] C. Camacho and A. Lins Neto, *Geometric Theory of Foliations*, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985.
- [CC] A. Candel and L. Conlon, *Foliations. II*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 60. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. xiv+545 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-0881-8.
- [FF] B. Farb and J. Franks, *Groups of homeomorphisms of one-manifolds, I: Nonlinear group actions*, June 2001 preprint.
- [FW] J. Franks, and B. Williams, *Anomalous Anosov flows*. Global theory of dynamical systems (Proc. Internat. Conf., Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill., 1979), pp. 158–174, Lecture Notes in Math., 819, Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [HaPo1] A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie, *Pointwise partial hyperbolicity in three-dimensional nil-manifolds*. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 89 (2014), no. 3, 853–875.
- [HaPo2] A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie, *Classification of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms in 3-manifolds with solvable fundamental group*. J. Topol. 8 (2015), no. 3, 842–870.

- [HaPo3] A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie, *Partial hyperbolicity and classification: a survey*. to appear in Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems.
- [Ha] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [HP] M. Hirsch and C. Pugh, *Stable manifolds for hyperbolic sets*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 75. 1969. 149–152.
- [HPS] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Invariant manifold*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 583. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977. ii+149 pp.
- [HHU1] F. Rodriguez Hertz, J. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures, *A survey of partially hyperbolic dynamics. Partially hyperbolic dynamics, laminations, and Teichmüller flow*. 35–87, Fields Inst. Commun., 51, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [HHU2] F. Rodriguez Hertz, J. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures, *Some results on the integrability of the center bundle for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms*. Partially hyperbolic dynamics, laminations, and Teichmüller flow, 103C109, Fields Inst. Commun., 51, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [HHU3] F. Rodriguez Hertz, J. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures, *Tori with hyperbolic dynamics in 3-manifolds*. J. Mod. Dyn. 5 (2011), no. 1, 185–202.
- [HHU4] F. Rodriguez Hertz, J. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures, *A non-dynamically coherent example on $\mathbb{T}^3$* . Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 33 (2016), no. 4, 1023–1032.
- [HHU5] F. Rodriguez Hertz, J. Rodriguez Hertz and R. Ures, *Center-unstable foliations do not have compact leaves*. arXiv:1502.00125
- [Ho] O. Hölder, *Die Axiome der Quantität und die Lehre vom Mass*. Ber. Verh. Sachs. Ges. Wiss. Leipzig, Math. Phys. C1. 53, 1-64 (1901).
- [N] S. P. Novikov, *The topology of foliations*. (Russian) Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obshch. 14 1965 248–278.
- [PS] C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Stably ergodic dynamical systems and partial hyperbolicity*, Journal of Complexity 13 (1997), no. 1, 125–179.

Jinhua Zhang,

School of Mathematical Sciences

Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

E-mail : zjh200889@gmail.com

and

Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne

UMR 5584 du CNRS

Université de Bourgogne, 21004 Dijon, FRANCE

E-mail : jinhua.zhang@u-bourgogne.fr